



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Mendocino City Community Services District	County	Mendocino
Project Title	Mendocino Groundwater Quality Assessment	Grant Request	\$ 249,977.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 249,977.00

Project Description: The Mendocino City Community Services District proposal initiates and assesses groundwater quality through water quality sampling, groundwater threat assessment, groundwater model analysis, and developing a Groundwater Protection Plan.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	8
Budget	4
Schedule	5
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	5
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	37

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. Applicant presents Adopting Groundwater Extraction Permit Ordinance, Ordinance #90-1, as a proof of adoption of their GWMP. Groundwater Extraction Permit Ordinance was the first step of the Groundwater Management Program in the management area. Additional Groundwater Management Programs were added to the GWMP later.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The application includes a complete and detailed description of the proposed project – which primarily focuses on water quality issues in the water management area. Collaboration with other local public agencies in the water management area and an established procedure for public outreach is demonstrated. The proposal describes the long-term need for the project and that valuable information and definite knowledge will be obtained once the project is implemented.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The applicant provides a detailed description of the proposed project that includes clearly defined end product. The tasks support the goals of the proposal but they are not entirely consistent with the budget and schedule. For example, the Subtask 1.2 in the work plan is divided into two subtasks in the budget and schedule. The Subtask 4.3 in the work plan describes Groundwater Protection Plan whereas, in the budget and schedule, Subtask 4.3 is titled “Groundwater Quality Monitoring Plan.” Other task names in the work plan do not exactly match the task names in the budget and schedule. Submittal of progress reports and invoices described in Task 6 of the work plan are not included in the schedule. The end product of the project will result in improving groundwater management within the District boundaries. Applicant includes the process on how the information gained by the proposed project will be disseminated. CEQA is adequately addressed in the proposal.
- **Budget:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The applicant presents a budget that seems realistic and includes sufficient details, such as labor hours, labor rates, direct costs, and total costs. The applicant also includes estimated project cost for water quality sampling and analytical laboratory costs in Table 6-3. However the tasks in the Table 6-1, Budget Summary Table, are not consistent with the tasks in the Table 6-2, detailed budget table. Also, the description of how costs were derived lacks detail.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant provides a schedule that is realistic and includes appropriate detailed tasks defining how the schedule was derived. The applicant will be ready to proceed with the project when funding becomes available. All task work will be started and completed with the PSP designated time frame. The duration of this project is 16 months, beginning April 1, 2013 and ending June 30, 2014.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant provides well-defined QA/QC measures that will be used in each phase of the project. These QA/QC measures include procedural assurances, personnel qualifications, a sampling and analysis plan, peer review, and others. QA/QC measures are included in the work plan.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant demonstrates it is capable of performing high quality work, managing funds, and meeting deadlines for similar type of projects. The applicant managed two LGA grants in the past and was able to complete work on time and within budget. A DWR Performance Evaluation for one of these LGA grants is provided to support the claim.